REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-44 are pending. Claims 11, 13, 18, and 29 have been amended to more particularly point out the subject matter of the invention. No claims have been added, canceled, or withdrawn. In view of the following remarks/arguments, withdrawal of all outstanding objections and rejections to the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112

Claims 11, 13-16, 18, and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. As suggested by the Action, claims 11, 13, 18, and 29 have been amended to replace respective "and/or" phrases with the term "or". Claims 14-16 depend upon amended claim 13. In view of these amendments, withdrawal of the 35 USC §112, second paragraph rejections to claims 11, 13-16, 18, and 29 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 20-21, 23, 25, 30-34, and 36 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. patent application publication no. US 2002/138844 to Otenasek et al ("Otenasek") in view of U.S. patent application publication no. US 2001/0036355 to Kelly et al ("Kelly"). These rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 recites in part "accessing, by a computing device, a first playlist that has a non-canonical data format", "providing, by a computing device, a plurality of translators that translate playlists from a plurality of different non-

canonical formats to a canonical playlist format", "calling, by a computing device, one of the translators to translate the first playlist into the canonical playlist format", and forming a second playlist in the canonical playlist format". Nowhere do the references of record teach or suggest these recited features.

As a preliminary matter, reasons why Otenasek does not teach or suggest a playlist were already presented in the response filed on 12/01/03. Those arguments are incorporated by reference and not repeated verbatim herein. However, the Office is urged to reconsider those arguments in view of the following additional arguments.

In addressing claim 1, the Action asserts that "Otenasek's streaming media files (e.g., Audio Video Interleaved – AVI files) fit the generic definition of a 'playlist'provided in the instant specification." Applicant disagrees; Otenasek's streaming media content files do not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed "playlist". As clearly described in the background section of the patent application, a playlist does not include the actual media data of a streaming media data container file such as a file based on AVI data format. It is well known that streaming media data includes compressed video / audio data, image frames, motion compensation data, frame-to-frame sequencing information, and so on. Applicant's "playlist", which does not include such streaming media data, is in stark contrast to Otenasek's AVI data file, which does contain streaming media data that is based on Microsoft WINDOWS Resource Interchange File Format (RIFF) specification. It is well known that such streaming media data container files such as Otenasek's AVI files, or any other streaming media data container files, do not teach or suggest "a playlist" as claim 1 recites.

In view of this well known difference between "a playlist", as claimed, and streaming media data container files such as AVI files, the Action's assertion that "Otenasek's streaming multimedia files are considered to be "playlists" as recited in claim 1 and as clearly described in the background section of the patent application, modifies Otenasek's AVI data files into something for which Otenasek's streaming media data container files were never intended; that is, into a playlist data file format that does not contain actual streaming media data. Since this modification removes actual media data from files of Otenasek, Otenasek as modified would no longer be able to stream media data, which is completely contrary to the purpose of Otenasek, which relies on an AVI file to include actual media data for streaming. Thus, the suggested modification destroys the invention of Otenasek by making an AVI file completely inoperable for its intended purpose, which is to contain actual media data. This unsuggested modification to Otenasek is even more pronounced since the term "playlist", as used by Applicant, is not even present in the publication of Otenasek.

In view of the above and contrary to what the Action asserts the Action's modification to Otenasek is beyond the "broadest reasonable interpretation of the term 'playlist' in light of the specification".

The Action further asserts that "assuming arguendo that Otenasek's streaming multimedia file is not a 'playlist' as claimed, the irrefutable similarities provide direct suggestion for housing, translating, and streaming playlists as Otenasek's streaming multimedia content, especially since Otenasek explicitly states that any type of multimedia content or encoding standard can be used." Applicant disagrees at least for the reasons already discussed. At least for those reasons, the asserted "irrefutable similarities" have been refuted.

As an additional matter, since: (1) Otenasek does not even use the term "playlist"; (2) the Office is making an inoperable modification to Otenasek by removing actual media data from the streaming media container files; and (3) since the Office is asserting that this modified AVI file can be used as a "playlist" as claimed to stream other multimedia data container files, the Office is seemingly relying on personal knowledge to make these modifications to Otenasek.

> *"When a rejection in an application is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the office, the data shall be as specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by the affidavit of such employee, and such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons." 37 CFR §1.104(d)(2).*

In view of this, if the Office maintains these modifications to Otenasek in a subsequent action, the Examiner is respectfully requested to supply an affidavit that supports each of these modifications to the streaming media data container files and system of Otenasek.

With respect to Otenasek in view of Kelly, the Action further asserts that assuming that Otenasek does not teach or suggest a playlist, "Kelly discloses a system and method similar to that of Otenasek, wherein the content store, translated, and streamed is organized by a 'playlist' as claimed." Applicant disagrees, especially since a prima facie case of obviousness must be supported with respect to the claim as a whole, not just with respect to a single feature of the claim.

More particularly, Kelly at ¶ 1 teaches "smooth playback (i.e., "reducing audio and video disturbance to the user", see ¶14) of edited audio/video streams in a transport stream format in compliance with the MPEG-2 specification". To this end, Kelly at ¶7 and ¶8 teaches improving on "the concept of bridge sequences to re-code frames and re-multiplex audio and video from the two streams in the bridge sequence. This bridge sequence links together two streams while maintaining coding compliance, enabling frame-accurate edits to be edited, with smooth playback via the standard decoder." At ¶ 24, Kelly teaches storing "the bridge sequence [of transport packets, ¶21] on a record carrier together with said first and second sequences [of frame-based data, ¶19] and playlist information. In such an embodiment, the additional transport packets [i.e., the playlist information] may be included in the stored bridge sequence, or alternatively may be generated during reproduction by the apparatus." At ¶25, Kelly teaches that "additional transport packets [playlist information], each has its own continuity counter value, to as to define an edited sequence of transport packets linking said first and second edit points". Kelly, at ¶93 teaches that such linking is providing by pointing to a "logical address of the data, or by reference to a time value."

In view of the above, Kelly's playlist is not "a playlist" as Applicant claims, which does not contain actual media data. Instead, Kelly's playlist is actual media data that is stored on an optical disk 3 (see Fig. 1) or generated by a decoding device 12 to decode the specific media data frames and motion / time compensation information in a media data container file. Kelly at ¶7 teaches that when the playlist is used to decode media data (content of a media data container file) that is based on the MPEG data format, that the playlist identifies logical addresses or timing references (¶93) to intra-coded (I) frames, predictive (P)

frames, and/or bi-directionally (B) coded frames. Thus, Kelly's playlist will always contain media data – media data providing I, P, or B frame sequencing information.

For these reasons alone, Kelly does not resolve the above described deficiencies of Otenasek.

Moreover, a modification to a reference that contradicts the teachings of the reference is not a modification that would be made by a person of ordinary skill in the art in view of the reference. It is respectfully submitted that the Action's suggested modification to Kelly would likely make the invention of Kelly inoperable. More particularly, Kelly teaches at ¶4, "the skilled person will recognise [sic] many problems in the practical recording and editing of digital video streams using a single decoder. As is well known to the skilled reader, the original recordings must be generated and stored in compliance with many different inter-related components, what are specified to ensure playback is possible". In view of the above, modifying Kelly to remove this frame specific media data from the media data transport sequence of Kelly to arrive at "a playlist" as recited by claim 1 – which does not include media data, the edited media data sequence of Kelly will likely become un-decodable / unplayable, or at least lose subvert Kelly's invention for "smooth playback of edited audio/video data" (¶1). Because the Action's modification to Kelly would likely subvert the purpose and operability of Kelly, it is respectfully submitted that a person of ordinary skill in view of Kelly would not make the Action's suggested modification(s).

For each of the above reasons, neither Otenasek nor Kelly singly or Otenasek in view of Kelly in combination teach or suggest "a playlist" as recited

by claim 1. For these reasons alone, a prima-facie case of obviousness has not been presented with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 over Otenasek in view of Kelly is improper and should be withdrawn.

Additionally, claim 1 recites other features that are not taught or suggested by the cited combination. For instance, claim 1 recites that "a first playlist that has a non-canonical data format". For the reasons already discussed, Otenasek in view of Kelly does not teach or suggest "a playlist" as claim 1 recites. Thus, the combination cannot teach or suggest "a first playlist that has a non-canonical data format" as Applicant claims.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites "providing, by a computing device, a plurality of translators that translate playlists from a plurality of different non-canonical formats to a canonical playlist format". This feature is not taught or suggested by the cited combination.

Otenasek's conversion of media data encoded in one of multiple possible *multimedia content data formats* (e.g., MPEG, MOV, AVI, RM) to a uniform multimedia file data format (e.g., the AVI data format), does not teach or suggest "translators that translate playlists from a plurality of different non-canonical formats to a canonical playlist format". As already discussed, the claimed "playlist" is not a container for media data in any multimedia data content data format (e.g., MPEG, MOV, AVI, or RM). Thus, Otenasek is completely silent with respect to these claimed features. Moreover, the teaching of Kelly of media data content with frame sequencing information does not resolve this deficiency of Oteneasak. Thus, the cited combination of Otenasek in view of Kelly may never

include "a plurality of translators that translate playlists from a plurality of different non-canonical formats to a canonical playlist format", as claim 1 recites.

For these same reasons, the combination does not teach or suggest "calling, by a computing device, one of the translators to translate the first playlist into the canonical playlist format", and forming a second playlist in the canonical playlist format", as claim 1 recites.

For each of these additional reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 over Otenasek in view of Kelly is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4, 6, and 7 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over Otenasek in view of Kelly by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of these claims is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 recites "a playlist server component that uses a canonical playlist to represent playlists, each canonical playlist having a canonical data format", translator components for use by the playlist server component, the translator components accepting non-canonical playlists having non-canonical formats for translation to the canonical format", and "wherein the playlist server performs operations comprising: receiving a non-canonical playlist", "providing the non-canonical playlist to one of the translator components to translate the non-canonical playlist into the canonical format for addition to the canonical playlist", and "streaming media referenced by the canonical playlist." For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, Otenasek in view of Kelly does not teach or suggest "a canonical playlist" as recited in claim 20. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 20 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 21-23, 25, and 30 depend from claim 20 and are patentably distinguished from Otenasek in view of Kelly by virtue of this

dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 21-23, 25, and 30 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 31 recites "accessing a first playlist that has a non-canonical format", "providing a plurality of translators to translate playlists from a plurality of different native data formats to a canonical data format", and "invoking one of the translators to translate the first playlist into the canonical data format, forming a second playlist that is based on the canonical data format." For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, Otenasek in view of Kelly does not teach or suggest "a first playlist" as recited in claim 31. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 31 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 32-34 and 36 depend from claim 31 and are patentably distinguished over Otenasek in view of Kelly by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 32-34, and 36 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 8, 9, 24, and 38-39 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,564,263 to Bergman et al ("Bergman"). These rejections are traversed.

As a preliminary matter, reasons why Otenasek in view of Bergman does not teach or suggest the features of claims 8, 9, 24, and 38-39 were presented in the response filed on 12/01/03. Those are arguments are not repeated verbatim herein. However, those arguments are incorporated by reference, and the Office is urged to reconsider those arguments in view of the following.

Claim 8 recites "wherein the canonical playlist format is a Synchronized Multimedia Integration Language (SMIL) data format". In addressing claim 8, the ACTION asserts, at page 8, section 5, that "Otenasek as modified by Kelly discloses the method [...] wherein the canonical playlist format is AVI format and an AVI encoder interface is used to create the second playlist." However, for the reasons already discussed with respect to claim 1, the cited combination does not teach or suggest "a playlist" as recited in claim 1, and from which claim 8 depends. For these same reasons, the cited combination does not teach or suggest "the canonical playlist format" as recited by dependent claim 8.

Additionally, the Action concedes that Otenasek in view of Kelly does not teach or suggest use of a SMIL data format. Instead, the Action relies on Bergman, which teaches the use of SMIL, to conclude that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to create Otenasek's canonical playlists using SMIL, use SMIL, as taught by Bergman, rather than an AVI data format. This conclusion is unsupportable.

The tertiary reference, Bergman, teaches the use of SMIL for describing domain specific metadata associated with multimedia content (col. 2, lines 37-56). These teachings are completely silent with respect to the use of SMIL to encode "a playlist" as recited by claim 1, especially since Bergman does not teach or suggest the use of any playlist in its system for multimedia content description. Thus, the addition of Bergman to the combination of Otenasek in view of Kelly does not resolve the already discussed deficiency of Otenasek in view of Kelly. For these reasons, Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Bergman does not teach or suggest the recited features of claim 8..

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 8 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 recites "creating, by a computing device, the second playlist via a SMIL interface." For the reasons already discussed with respect to claim 8, the cited combination of Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Bergman does not teach or suggest these recited features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 9 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 24 and 38 recite "wherein the canonical data format is SMIL data format." For the reasons already discussed with respect to claim 8, the cited combination of Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Bergman does not teach or suggest these recited features. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 24 and 38 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 39 recites "wherein a SMIL interface is used to form the second playlist." For the reasons already discussed with respect to claim 8, the cited combination of Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Bergman does not teach or suggest these recited features. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 39 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 10-19, 22, 26-29, 35, 37, and 40-44 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,974,503 to Venkatesh et al ("Venkatesh"). These rejections are traversed.

As a preliminary matter, reasons why Otenasek in view of Venkatesh does not teach or suggest the features of claims 5, 10-19, 22, 26-29, 35, 37, and 40-44

were already presented in the response filed on 12/01/03. Those are arguments are not repeated verbatim herein. However, those arguments are incorporated by reference and the Office is urged to reconsider those arguments in view of the following arguments.

Claims 5 and 10-19 depend from claim 1. For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Otenasek in view of Kelly does not teach or suggest "a playlist" as recited in claim 1, and from which claims 5, and 10-19 depend. With respect to Venkatesh, nowhere does Venkatesh teach or suggest converting a playlist from one data format to a different data format. Thus, the secondary reference does not teach or suggest "translators that translate playlists", "a canonical playlist format", "translat[ing] the first playlist into the canonical playlist format", and "forming a second playlist in the canonical playlist format", as claim 1 recites. For these reasons alone, the cited combination does not teach or suggest "providing, by a computing device, a plurality of translators that translate playlists from a plurality of different non-canonical formats to a canonical playlist format", and "calling, by a computing device, one of the translators to translate the first playlist into the canonical playlist format, forming a second playlist in the canonical playlist format", as claim 1 recites. Because claims 5, and 10-19 depend from claim 1, the cited combination does not teach or suggest the features of claims 5, and 10-19.

For these reasons alone, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 5 and 10-19 over Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Venkatesh is improper and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, claims 5 and 10-19 include additional features that are not taught or suggested by the references of record. For instance, claim 5 recites

"dynamically interrupting, by a computing device, a particular media item as it is being streamed from the second playlist." In addressing this claimed feature, the Action asserts that Kelly's playlist format as applied to the system and method of Otenasek allows for modification / editing of the content items. Applicant disagrees.

As already discussed, the content of the claimed "playlist" does not include actual media content. Moreover, as already discussed, the playlist of Kelly is actual media content, and therefore, not a "playlist" as claimed. Thus, it is irrelevant whether Otenasek in view of Kelly teaches editing of actual media content. What is relevant is that the claimed feature is "dynamically interrupting, by a computing device, a particular media item as it is being streamed from the second playlist". Since neither Otenesak nor Kelly singly or in combination teach or suggest such a claimed "second playlist", then the cited combination does not teach or suggest the claimed "dynamically interrupting".

Moreover, the Action has already admitted that Otenasek is silent on detailed functionality of the streaming process. Referring to figure 1 of Kelly, Kelly teaches that edited media content is stored on an optical disk or some other storage medium. Nowhere does Kelly teach or suggest that edited media content is streamed to any other computing device. Nowhere does Kelly teach or suggest that edited media content is dynamically interrupted during playback. It is respectfully submitted that modifying the cited combination to include dynamic interruption as suggested by the Action would subvert the purpose for which the system of Kelly was designed for smooth playback of the piece of edited content. For these additional reasons, Kelly does not suggest any such modification of Otenasek to allow for dynamic interruption of anything being streamed.

With respect to the combination of Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Venkatesh, Venkatesh teaches at col. 47, lines 36-42, "[i]n response to a 'destroy sessions' command, the video fileserver stops in a transmission of a session's continue as media data and releases all server resources which were allocated to the session." This however does not teach or suggest "dynamically interrupting [...] a particular media item as it is being streamed from the second playlist", as Applicant claims. Recall, referring to claim 1 from which claim 5 depends, that "the second playlist" is a playlist that has been converted from a non canonical playlist data format to "a canonical playlist format". Thus, a system of Venkatesh may never interrupt streaming of any media item from a playlist that had been converted from a first playlist data format into a different playlist data format.

For each of these reasons, the cited combination does not teach or suggest the features of claim 5. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 5 over Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Venkatesh is improper and should be withdrawn.

In another example, claim 10 recites, "providing, by a computing device, one or more transformers that impose respective policies on content referenced by the first playlist", and "notifying, by a computing device, at least one transformer of the one or more transformers to impose a policy on the content referenced by the second playlist." The action addresses this claim as it addressed claim 5. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 5, claim 10 is also patentably distinguished over Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Venkatesh. Thus, the 35 USC§103(a) rejection of claim 10 over the cited combination is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 11 recites "imposing, by the at least one transformer, the policy results in a modification to the second playlist, the modification removing a reference from the second playlist, adding a reference to the second playlist, changing the order of references in the second playlist; and/or modifying a reference to content in the second playlist." For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 5, the references of record do not teach or suggest any such "second playlist". Accordingly, the 35 USC§103(a) rejection of claim 11 over Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Venkatesh is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 12 recites "the one or more transformers are one or more corresponding COM objects." In addressing this claim, the Action concedes that Venkatesh does not teach or suggest the features of claim 12. Instead, the Action relies on the transcoders of Otenasek to conclude and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of intention to arrive at these claimed features. This conclusion is unsupportable because ¶ 31 of Otenasek merely describes that file encoders are used to convert one of multiple possible uploaded multimedia content data formats to a uniform multimedia file data format. For the reasons already discussed, converting media content data container file data formatting does not teach or suggest the claimed features. Accordingly, the 35 USC§103(a) rejection of claim 12 over Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Venkatesh is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 13 recites modifying, by a supervisory component the second playlist to insert a new reference into the second playlist, delete a reference from the second playlist, change an order of associated media content references, and/or modify a reference in the second playlist", and "wherein the modifying is

performed while streaming media referenced by the second playlist to a client computing device." For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 5, the references of record do not teach or suggest any such "second playlist".

Accordingly, the 35 USC§103(a) rejection of claim 13 over Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Venkatesh is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 14 recites "dynamically interrupting, by the supervisory component, a particular media item as it is being streamed to insert another media item." The Action concedes that Otenasek in view of Kelly does not teach or suggest these features. In addressing these claimed features, the Action concludes that these features are obvious in view of teachings of Venkatesh wherein a playlist is interrupted as referenced content is being streamed, adding a clip to the playlist, and continuing playback of the playlist after inserting a clip. For the reasons already discussed with respect to claim 5, this conclusion is unsupportable. Moreover, for the reasons discussed in the 12/01/03 response, the only time that a clip can be inserted into a playlist of Venkatesh is when they clip that is currently being streamed will not be interrupted. Thus, the references of record do not teach or suggest "dynamically interrupting" as Applicant claims.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 14 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 recites "dynamically interrupting, by the supervisory component, a particular media item as it is being streamed", "streaming, by the supervisory component, another media item", and "resuming, by the supervisory component, a set of operations specified by the second playlist". For the reasons discussed

above with respect to claim 14, the references of record do not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 15 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 16 recites "wherein the supervisory component is a COM object." Further reasons already discussed, the references of record do not teach or suggest such a "supervisory component".

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 16 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 17 recites "accessing, by a computing device, a playlist", "imposing, by the computing device, a policy on the content referenced by the playlist in a manner that is independent of a modification to the playlist, wherein imposing the policy results in a particular set of media references", and "retrieving, by a computing device, media content referenced by the particular media references." In addressing these features, the Action rejects this claim analogously to how it rejected claims 1 and 10. However, claim 17 includes features that are not present in claims 1 and 10.

For instance, claim 17 includes a feature that imposes a policy on content referenced by a playlist in a manner that is independent to any modification to the playlist. Otenasek in view of Kelly is completely silent with respect to any playlist. And, although Venkatesh teaches editing a playlist, all such edits are described as changing the playlist. Accordingly, a system of Otenasek in view of Kelly and further in view of Venkatesh may never "imposing, by the computing device, a policy on the content referenced by the playlist in a manner that is independent of a modification to the playlist", as claim 17 recites.

For these reasons alone, and as discussed above, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 17 is improper and should be withdrawn.

As an additional matter, and as previously requested in the 12/01/03 response, if this claim is again rejected in a subsequent Office action on a similar basis, it is respectfully requested for the Office to please particularly point out where the references of record describe, teach or suggest "imposing, by the computing device, a policy on the content referenced by the playlist in a manner that is independent of a modification to the playlist".

Claim 18 recites "removing, by the computing device, a media content reference, adding a media content reference, changing an order of media content references, and/or modifying a media content reference. Claim 18 depends on claim 17 and is allowable over the references of record by virtue of this dependency. For this additional reason, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 18 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 22 recites "dynamically interrupting a particular media item as it is being streamed from the second canonical playlist." As discussed above, nowhere do the references of record teach such a "second canonical playlist". Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn.

Claim 26 recites "a supervisory component that communicates with the playlist server component to dynamically modify the canonical playlist while the playlist server component streams the content referenced by the canonical playlist." For the reasons discussed, the references of record do not teach or suggest these features (e.g., a "canonical playlist").

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 26 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 27 recites wherein the supervisory component uses a graphical user interface to visualize and manually manipulate elements and attributes of the canonical playlist." As discussed, the cited references singly or in combination do not teach or suggest "the canonical playlist." Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 27 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 28 recites "providing the second canonical playlist to the playlist transformation component to impose the policy on the content referenced by the second canonical playlist." For the reasons already discussed, the cited references singly or in combination do not teach or suggest "the canonical playlist." Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 28 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 29 recites "providing the canonical playlist to the playlist transformation component results in a modification to the canonical playlist, the modification removing a reference from the second playlist, adding a reference to the second playlist, changing the order of the playlist references, and/or modifying a reference in the canonical playlist." For the reasons already discussed, the cited references singly or in combination do not teach or suggest "the canonical playlist." Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 29 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 35 recites "dynamically interrupting a particular media item as it is being streamed. For the reasons already discussed, the cited references singly or in combination do not teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 35 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 37 "recites interrupting a particular media item as it is being streamed", "streaming another media item", and "resuming a set of operations

specified by the second playlist." For the reasons already discussed, the cited references singly or in combination do not teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 37 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 40 recites "providing a plurality of transformers that impose respective policies on content referenced by the first playlist" and, "notifying one of the transformers to impose a policy on content referenced by the second playlist". For the reasons already discussed, the cited references singly or in combination do not teach or suggest these features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 40 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 41 recites "wherein imposing the policy results in a modification to the second playlist, the modification being selected from a group comprising (a) removing a reference from the second playlist, (b) adding a reference to the second playlist, (c) changing the order of references in the second playlist, and (d) modifying a reference in the second playlist. For the reasons already discussed, the cited references singly or in combination do not teach or suggest these features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 41 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 42 recites "wherein the server and the plurality of transformers are COM objects." For the reasons already discussed, the cited references singly or in combination do not teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 42 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 43 recites "dynamically modifying the second playlist while streaming the media referenced by the second playlist, the modification being selected from a group of modifications comprising (a) inserting a new reference into the second playlist, (b) deleting a reference from the second playlist, (c) changing the order of the references; and (d) modifying a reference in the second playlist. For the reasons already discussed, the cited references singly or in combination do not teach or suggest these features.

Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 43 is improper and should be withdrawn

Claim 44 recites "interrupting a particular media item as it is being streamed to stream a different media item. For the reasons already discussed, the cited references singly or in combination do not teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103 rejection of claim 44 is improper and should be withdrawn

Conclusion

Claims 1-44 are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 6/23/04

By: Brian Hart

Brian G. Hart
Reg. No. 44, 421
(303) 539-0265 x241